

---

BEIJING – ALAC Executive Committee  
Friday, April 12, 2013 – 09:00 to 12:00  
ICANN – Beijing, People’s Republic of China

MATT ASHTIANI: Today is Friday 12 April; this is the ALAC Executive Committee. The Chair has asked if everyone could say their name starting with Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: Good morning it's Julie Hammer, SSAC Liaison.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier Crepin-Leblond, ALAC Chair.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Evan Leibovitch, Vice Chair.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Carlton Samuels, Vice Chair.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Dev Anand Teelucksingh, ALAC member from LACRALO.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani Ben Jemaa, member.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

MAUREEN: Maureen, I'm just here as an observer from APRALO.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Rinalia Abdul Rahim, ExCom.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay well welcome everyone for our last day of work. Today we're going to be speaking first to David Olive. Then we will have a visit with Steve Crocker, after that we will have Steve Antonoff who is going to be speaking to us about travel and giving us details on the transition to the person who will replace him. And then we will have the Beijing action items.

But because we've already touched on the action items yesterday, all of the action items that we have to do, we might just hone in on one or two that we wish to pursue further. Afterwards we might have a visit from Xavier Calvez, CFO. Let's get on the ALAC liaisons. We have one liaison who is with us, Julie Hammer SSAC liaison.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you Olivier. It's been a really busy week. These meetings seem to get busier and busier. I find that my timetable is full of SSAC related meetings and also some DSSA working group related meetings. And only gave me the opportunity to come and visit with the ALAC on Sunday and only very briefly on two other occasions.

We had our SSAC public meeting which of course because ALAC had already had a private meeting with SSAC probably wasn't as relevant for ALAC members to attend, followed by the report by the consultants

---

who've been doing the DNS risk management framework for the board, followed by some discussions with the DSSA working group.

And I think Olivier you will probably be reporting on that in another context, I won't go into that. I think that's progressing satisfactorily but not as quickly as some of us would like but at least it's heading in the right direction. The thing I did want to dwell on for a minute or two was I think one of the most interesting sessions of the week which was the new gTLD Security Stability and Resiliency Session on Monday afternoon which had a panel including the ICANN security staff and a couple of members of SSAC.

And there were some really interesting interactions from the floor during that meeting with some additional concerns expressed about the new gTLD program. Now I have done a two page report on that meeting which I haven't been able to post yet because of my iPad limitations but I hand them out to all of you last night and you probably haven't had a chance to look at it.

What I tried to do was encapsulate in as nontechnical language as I could what the concepts were that were raised there. during our meeting with SSAC you had some full discussions on the issue that's been identified in SAC 57 which is the certificate authority's issue where someone can purchase a certificate for an internal server that may in fact be the same string as a yet to be delegated gTLD, so that once the gTLD is delegated they can launch a man in the middle attack.

Well during this session on Monday some further concerns were raised about other situations where whether names have certificates or not there can be some problems in resolving web queries for strings that

---

might have the same name as a new gTLD but at the second or third level. For example, if an internal named server or even a web server has example.com as its string then if example is a new gTLD there are concerns that there can be some incorrect routing associated with those queries?

And there are a number of strings or names that have been commonly used in internal service setups. They're listed there in my report that strings like .localdomain, .domain, .local, .internet, that are really expected to cause problems if any of those strings are permuted as gTLDs. There is an additional issue that's been raised there that needs to be looked at in addition to the certificate authority issue.

Now this issue was in fact highlighted in set 45 quite some time ago. And the recommended actions have not been taken; it's not a new thing it's something that was highlighted earlier. But it's now getting pretty close to the wire to get these things resolved. For me that was one of the most interesting meetings of the week. And as I said please have a look at that two page report. I will be posting it on the web and it will form part of my overall report on the meeting, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Julie and I open the floor for questions. The use of internal domain names and of course we have the latest SSAC advice. But you mentioned that with regards to rooting etc., were described on SSAC 45 and yet was not followed. Is there an analysis performed as to why that was not followed?

---

JULIE HAMMER:

That is an issue that's currently under discussion in SSAC. I think up till now I think the SSAC other than observing that the advice hasn't been followed hasn't taken it any further. I think Patrick is looking at that issue to see what SSAC might wish to follow-up on in that regard. I think one of the concerns that SSAC has is that it doesn't want to be drawn into part of the implantation process.

It's an advisory board. It's given its advice and it's now somebody else's role to implement but your question is still valid, what's the point of giving advice if nobody follows it. I think it's something that is of concern to SSAC and that it will be looking into.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Julie. From a user's point of view this is a particularly important thing to focus on. Ultimately if the internet breaks because of the introduction of the new gTLDs that will directly affect users. And the use of internal addresses in companies and many companies that might have LANs or their own system and as a network engineer having many clients that have their own internal networks, the naming inside their network might be using a wide array of internal domains and that was very well described in SSAC 45. I remember when it was released.

Would it be worth the SSAC following up on reviewing whether it's advice, maybe not only SSAC 45 but other advice that it has given in the past and seeing if this was implemented? It seems like everything in ICANN you chuck something over the wall and there is no review process or audit afterwards on whether it's followed or not.

---

JULIE HAMMER: You've raised a point that a couple of other people have raised in conversations I've been having and I think it is a very valid point. And in fact, so many people have raised this that I think I'll approach Patrick to see if SSAC is willing to do that a little more formally.

You're right it is a real concern for users and not just the users but in one of the sessions someone from the ISP constituency and in deed the ISP constituency when the SSAC met with them has a concern. Because when users have a problem they don't ring ICANN and say "You didn't implement SAC 45. They ring their ISP and say I can't get to where I want to go.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, any other comments? Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not really a question, it is a comment. It's interesting we're now getting into areas where we are potentially affecting the effective stability and security of the net not in ways that ICANN can actually fix itself other than stop deploying any new TLDs and withdraw .museum and others because they might have some things or cause problems that are not under our control.

We can create that kind of problem today by someone naming a network unknowingly after one of the TLDs they haven't heard about.

JULIE HAMMER: You're right. But there are certain of those domain names that were actually advocated by server manufacturers and companies like

---

Microsoft and they are the big ones and we know what they are. I think the ones that might cause the most problems we can home in on and I think ICANN does not need to reach out to the wider beyond ICANN community to try and get some of these issues sorted.

And in fact, the SSAC public forum yesterday and a gentleman mentioned that as of the day before the Mozilla browser company had notified them about the they have committed to fix their browser in time.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Julie. One last question before we move on to GNSO. Do you think it would be worth the ALAC to remind ICANN that they have a duty to ensure the stability of the internet and during the roll out of the new gTLDs and that they better make sure that they are implementing the SSACs recommendations as we don't see those as being optional?

JULIE HAMMER: I think that would be very useful to add the ALAC voice to the other voices.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay any ExCom colleagues?

CARLTON SAMUELS: I think we should do it. I don't know how much it will add to it.

---

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I think it's quite important to do that therefore I support it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: You've heard me before using the concept of advising the Board where it's not appropriate, it's appropriate here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, so let's make this an action item being that the ALAC will draft a statement that will advise the Board to review the advice that has been given over the years by the SSAC and to implement it. Any other wording?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the wording needs to be careful. We don't want to [Inaudible 00:18:39] which no applies because it's seven years later but that overall intent, yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I guess we can call into effect statements that were made at the Board meeting yesterday where they refused to put down specific deadlines and said "Well do it when it's ready and we're going to jeopardize the safety or security of the DNS." Those came out of Fadi's mouth



---

yesterday. We now can take that and say okay here's your opportunity to hold true to your word, listen to this and don't do things until they're ready.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect. You have that Heidi? Thank you very much Julie. Next is Alan Greenberg who is our GNSO liaison who will provide us with a quick update. Alan you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The GNSO did not pass any formal motions at this meeting. There were two motions on the table. They ended up - one was withdrawn because reality had overtaken it. It was with regard to approving the RAA and the fact that the RAA appears to have been had closure already, changed the circumstances. The other one was more on the overall issue of process and things like that.

I don't really recall whether it was tabled or put I think it was deferred to the next meeting. It consisted of a rather embarrassing display of the GNSO in a public forum of people quibbling with each other, people not understanding what the rules of the GNSO are, people making effectively ad hominid comments about others at the table. It was triggered by things like the motion was put forward by Maria Fowler.

It was not clear if it was going to be voted on or not or if it was going to be discussed. The chair said he understood that the motion was going to be pulled back. Remember the GNSO requires advance motion so the world can change around them. Jeff Newman put his hand up and

---

said “Is the motion on the table to be discussed or are we just discussing the subject matter but the motion was withdrawn?”

And Milton’s answer was “It depends what you say” and it went downhill from there. It was not very satisfactory. It went into a quibbling over what the exact process should be, if a motion is tabled or deferred to the next meeting are you still allowed to talk about it? If you defer the motion because some people are not prepared, talking about it will help other people understand what the issues are. The issues of policy process dominated a lot of the discussion.

There were reviews of other things going on but in terms of the discussion the process and the Board - the GNSO quite miraculously actually answering a Board’s request on is this policy or is this not? And since some is policy and the next thing we hear staff has deemed it. That generated a huge amount of discussion and ill will on what we are here for anyway. If the Board can make any change it wants whenever it wants, including on policy issues why bother with us?

It's a relatively valid question. The position that the GNSO has taken in the past is that policy emanates from the GNSO. The Board has the right to reject a PDP if sufficient Board members do not agree with it. It is not clear from the bylaws that the Board has the right to fabricate new and different policy in its place. The position is shifting in a rational way.

It is saying the Board ultimately can make the decision. If you go as far back to the issues on morality and public order, that clearly was something that came out of the policy. The words came out of the

---

policy and yet when certain groups didn't like it went back and was revised.

The position that is coming out now is not uniform but it is strongly pushed by a number of people is that it is the GNSO role to develop policy in the gTLD space, that's bylaws. It is not unreasonable that going through reasonable process the Board disagrees or the GNSO is unable to come to closure and the Board makes a decision.

If that decision is countered to the GNSO in general people are not saying that is no allowed but that has to be accompanied by reasonable process of coming back and talking about why the recommendation is being rejected and having some give and take type discussion. I'm encouraged that is the direction we seem to be going in.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Does that conclude your GNSO report?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes and you'll have formal reports at a later time but that's the substance. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I was going to add to what Alan said, I was at the first day of the GNSO and it seems like this was something that evolved over the course of the week because when the counselors came in on the Saturday it was very much an angry meeting. It was very much almost nothing got done but people going around the table with various forms of how dare they?

---

For that to have evolved into the position that Alan described actually indicates that there was some evolution that happened over the weekend.

ALAN GREENBERG: There still is a how dare they but it's not how dare they make policy or set policy but how dare they do it in this crude way. They're back in the stage now that we were when we weren't getting an acknowledgement that our messages were being submitted to the Board. And they certainly weren't being replied to and there certainly was no give and take discussion.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Chair. I attended the policy and implementation session and listened to the different views of the stakeholders on the panel. And it strikes me as very interesting that there's such a wide range of differences. There are those that believe an overall framework is possible and those who do not. There seems to be a consensus that a cross community working group is the way to address it.

Alan will something concrete come out of the working group and is there now a clear line between what policy is and what is implementation, thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: That meeting was interesting. It brought out a number of things such as the concept of locking people in a room with a good negotiator and facilitator to try and come to closure. That problem with that is it presumes the people in that room can negotiate on behalf of larger groups, in many cases that is not possible. The GNSO also felt this is an issue we need to look at more and there is a strong feeling that a multi stakeholder group within ICANN do something about it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan, Jean Jacques?

JEAN JACQUES SUBRENAT: It's really not solely on the subject which has been debated for the past few minutes, it's a bit in the margins. It's the whole thing about advice, how it's responded to by the Board, etc. I find through experience that there is a greater diversity for the Board to react. It can be in writing. It can be already in a public session. It can be through remarks to and fro in a more personal way between Chairs. It can be a whole series of things.

What does this denote for me? It shows I think a different relationship. I saw a tense relationship between Board and community especially when I was on the Board. And this is no longer the case. I'm aiming to say here that the sociological reality is such that when you have contentious entities vying with each other or working against each other than the formality of the process is even more strongly applied.

---

Nowadays I think that is less the case. While respecting the need for formal processes I'm just underlining that there are more channels today.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean Jacques. We will be having Steve Croker soon. Evan please?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: That we had very different viewpoints of the two. And in fact from day one have championed the fact that they needed to be treated differently for very specific reasons. It is one thing to give advice and to find out that for good reason it's been either rejected, modified or considered not used.

It's quite another thing to find from three different Board directors that they had absolutely no clue that we had ever said this. And in fact in two cases Board members said to me "Boy I wish I had known about that. I had a desire to split this and I didn't know I had any backing in the community."

This is extremely frustrating to find out it's one thing to toss things over the wall, it's another thing to find out we could've had an effect but in fact didn't because the Board wasn't aware of it. Either one of two things is not happening, either our information isn't properly being brought to the Board or it's being deluged with comments from ALAC to the point where the salient things they need to find out from us aren't getting through or simply being swamped in a pile of statements.

---

I need to find out do we need to do something in terms of prioritizing or triaging the information we get to the Board so the things that we believe critically need to be addressed go to the top of the heap or how do we engage with you and the Board so that this doesn't happen again?

Because this is the ultimate frustrating thing especially going back to the ALSs and the RALOs that work really hard to turn this policy and to find out that we could've had an effect but didn't because they weren't even aware of how we thought? That is the first thing. The other thing came out yesterday during a public forum, and this happened to take the form of Fadi's comment.

The commitment to address in writing every single comment that was made at the public forum, guess what? That's more than At-Large gets!

We can have comment that takes months to turn through a bottom of process consulting with ALSs, make its way down to the chain, come up, have consultations from dozens, if not hundreds of people, take the form of a single statement from ALAC, and get less traction than five people standing up at the public forum to say the same thing because they have a financial interest that pays them to be there.

This is a matter of squeaky wheels at the public forum that is an ongoing matter of frustration. If the entire process of trying to turn information through At-Large, get surmounted by the fact that those who show up at the meetings are the ones that get listened to in preference to the stuff we've been working on for months and takes the form of a paper submission as opposed to people standing up and yelling, that's a problem. Anyway, those are my two.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. I can actually add for the record, because this could be considered that the ALAC could take over the public forum by lining up the whole ALAC to reach each and every one of our statements, and we have enough people to do that.

FEMALE: Hell yes! Paragraph by paragraph.

MALE: We can read everyone in the [record 00:03:24].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: There has been presidents in the allocation of a triple letter gTLD and that can be done again if it's that easy to capture things. So we don't want to do that, and obviously this needs to be addressed. Do you wish to respond or shall we go down the list of our...? Go ahead Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: There's two separate.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Right. Did we first finish with Rinalia? I think we did not get to that. If this is still part of the release of documents maybe I'll follow that train and come back to you back in policy and implementation. In terms of release of documents, they actually going to have to also talk to Steve



---

Crocker about, but the point is that the distribution is to the board of directors on their mailing list.

We send it to Board support and they sent it out. I don't have access to send things directly to the Board—that's just the way they organized themselves—but the issue is that the authors are flagging or put a cover letter that would say, "This is something. These three are more important than the next four," or something like that.

That's very important to do to flag for board support and also the Board what to read first if you will. In terms of the IGO/NGO protections, I mean, we're not at a policy at the moment, it's still a Board temporary protection until they sort all this out through the GNSO and so to that extent is possible the Board was waiting and still listening to a lot of views.

They might not have seen that or read that, but that's where we are at the moment, and that of course could be better input into the GNSO work as well, but at the stage they're soon, I think they're looking at Durbin as being a timeline for focus on that particular issue. In terms of being responded to, that's another one we're always working on and we haven't come to a perfect resolution of that in the policy development process where we most are responsible.

We do incorporate those into various reports inside that and I think the challenge again might be on the new gTLD side as to how you get response to those suggestions. My proposal would be that if they don't come in that written form, which is sometimes not easy to do, that you take that up when you have meetings with Christine Willett and others

---

at the ICANN meeting and kind of have them focused attention on that for you as another way to put pressure on us to make sure we respond.

I think finally we are looking at it in terms of changes and improvements to the public comment process in general. Ways to how do we respond to and provide information that we want and got in the comment, and to pointing out how it was used or not used.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Dev. There's one thing to note actually. We have meetings with policies support staff and with a whole lineup of policy staff. I don't recall having any meeting with Board Support staff. In fact, I don't even think that we know who supports the Board at the moment.

MALE: I do say anything.

FEMALE: But we need to fix it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: No.

MICHELLE BRIGHT: Olivier, I think you and Board Support need to develop a much close relationship because that's really important.

---

MALE: Sorry but Dev is—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And that's Michelle Bright who is—Diane Schroeder was director for many years, it's not Michelle Bright and Megan Bishop. Those are the two primaries, the two main people in Board Support for their secretariat if you will. That is under John Jeffrey's General Counsel, but is as he is counsel also to the Board, and that's where that falls in the organization.

MALE: Sorry, but just—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I want to sort of move on from this please because we're going to have Steve coming up soon. Maybe we can grill Steve on this, because these are just things that we've been speaking about for a while. I have a speaking list anyway to start with. So there's Alan Greenberg, then Cheryl Langdon-Orr and we can add one more person, Carlton, if you wish to afterwards. So Alan Greenberg will be first.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Alan Greenberg speaking. Number one, I think we had a question before of what do you see as the next steps in policy versus implementation which you didn't answer, so if you could make a note of it. I have a comment on the question of being inundated with paper. I'm on I think three of the working groups that turned out hundreds of pages of paper prior to this meeting.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's you!

ALAN GREENBERG: I might be personally responsible, yes. I know of nothing that motivates a working group to meet a deadline that is anywhere close to publishing in times where we can have a substantive discussion with the community, or in some cases with the working group in a face to face if things are going really bad at a meeting.

There is nothing that causes the group to coalesce and meet a target like that, like they need to get it out, partly because it's an artificial deadline but more important because it's an opportunity to discuss the issue with the community and get feedback to wherever we are on the process.

If there's any other way to do that, I think we need help from the policy staff and from every member of the community to suggest other mechanisms that might work because I don't see any way out of it, and I understand the implications of it, but it works and other things don't. I'm not really asking for an answer—

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: No, but this is important—

ALAN GREENBERG: We own this to the community to come up with better ways, is not just an ICANN staff issue.

---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I mean, one suggestion might be in terms of your statements to help the board. Maybe what we want if you're having four or five at the time or grouping them, do an executive overview or summary where they can link them to the real document, I mean, to the fuller document.

That would at least kind of focus attention on these of the six or three that we recently issued, a short talking about XYZ so it's an executive page that they can then click on to if they want to read further, but that at least gives them the highlights—headlines, highlights, whatever you want to call it—but it helps the busy Board Member, and we have board members here who could tell you that their workload is tremendous, but helps them in focusing on that.

It may help the problem that I've been mentioning that he didn't get that. Well, he might have gotten it but how much? Make it easier for them to get that in a two or three sentence highlight if you will, might be a way of doing that in addition to people want to read and some people do read the full reports.

It's amazing that they do and you hear them talking about some of the details and discussions at the workshops.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev. I'm mindful of the fact that Steve Crocker has entered the building. We'll have Cheryl Langdon-Orr and then Carlton Samuels and then we'll invite Steve to the floor. First Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. I'm delighted to come in to this particular point in the conversation because what I wanted to do, particularly in the expanding environment and as we regionalize and subregionalize we're going to concentrate work in a whole lot of places, so more materials are going to need to be handed, more materials are going to be need shifted around, more potential management or mismanagement.

All that organization flow can happen and I guess that somebody's job is going to make sure it doesn't get the mismanage. Just to remind everyone for—I feel like I'm sitting in Accountability and Transparency Review Chain number one, because I'm hearing the complaints from the community that we heard from just about every single room we went to.

We went through some effort to make some recommendations that have partially been implemented but not totally been implemented, and I know this work on that and I'm not asking you to deal into their. What I'm asking you to remember is, and it is particularly in your area, the requirement we sit hand in glove with the comment and reply comment concept was to have at least twelve to eighteen months of forecasting.

Now, that would help a great deal. It still allows for the importance and the necessary focus that Alan has described in work groups, but it means that staff could say, "There's just too much happening in [SSAC] meeting number one," and therefore guys you're going to have to wait three months to do that. We've go to have prior planning. Yes, there's always going to be exceptional things.

Yes, we have to be flexible. But if the main skeletal structure of policy development—I think that if I did a pop quiz of a staff even within one

---

of the bubbles, that lie between one of the bubbles, they are probably all working accidentally towards deadlines. That's really a management issue and I'd really like that to be looked at. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, I mean, no question about that. We have not been perfect in that regard. There is a challenge. You said the policy team, yes, we can say what's going to be on the GNSO agenda potentially, the ccNSO agenda. The SSAC they have plans in advance. Could we have predicted that we would be an RAA and RA of public comment?

The many strategic plan initiatives, the budget—all these things are somewhat hard to plan over a year that that's going to happen precisely. It's helpful to have a roadmap, I understand that, we try to do that, but with kind of the change of moving the participation engagement to a different group.

No question this has to be improved and we're looking at that and other tools that might help do that. It is indeed important but it's not ever going to be a perfect directory of what's coming down the line. But you need something rather than nothing and I understand that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Dev. I see just one quick thing. Current comment periods, upcoming comment periods seems to have stalled at the end of this year. Is this temporary or...?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I'm sorry?

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: There was an ATRT 1 recommendation that there should be upcoming comment periods being forecast and asked from the community. This worked for a whole year, at the end of the year it stopped. The person that was in charge of it left, no one else was allocated to it, it appears. Yes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I suggest you take that on notice, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I have mentioned it in two meetings already, this is the third one. It is got to be done. This is some really important thing for us and it's something which the ATRT 1 has said. It is a case of implementing a recommendation and then dropping the ball.

ALAN GREENBERG: Comment well taken.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: OK. Next Carlton Samuels.

CARLTON SAUMUELS: Thank you, Olivier. Carlton Samuels for the record. It's back to this idea of Board Members who are not getting the information that we think we need from both sides—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Carlton, would that be a question maybe perhaps to Steve?



---

CARLTON SAUMUELS: OK.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent, thank you. We—yes, go ahead Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Let me just complete the loop on policy and implementation that Rinalia asked about next steps. Obviously we have put up the paper; we have public comments from that. We’ve taken the comments from the discussions we had here in Beijing and what we are putting together a report on that.

What I see happening is there might be indeed a cross-community working group to look at other suggestions or mechanisms going forward. In the interim of course we are trying to make more clear the processes they go from policy development, which I rather exclusively stated in the by-laws, to the Board approval to the next steps of implementation, which may not be so clearly understood by groups.

To make that clear, improve some of the processes and people designates to take care of that on the implementation side. That should go at least organizationally a step forward in making that clear distinction as well to have feedback loops because the policy team does confer with the legal teams, with the services team, with the compliance teams at most of the steps of the PDP.

When we hand that offer implementation we also have continuing interactions. If you talk about what might be future processes in

---

addition to that, that we're waiting to hear from the community on that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: That's the plan.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I saw Sebastien Bachollet wanting to come into discussion. I think we have spent half hour with you. I hope you've enjoyed it. Thank you very much for joining us and we look forward to being able to speak to you at the Durbin meeting hopefully.

Oh! Time-wise you'll be quite close. In fact there is an official request we might put it as an action item for you, please bring some baklava from Istanbul, the delicious one with the almonds inside. Thank you very much.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. I cannot use the time zone changes as an excuse not to speak with you, so that's fine. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I now invite Steve Crocker, Chair of the Board, to join us on the hot seat or in the skillet, as we would call it. Thank you very much for joining us, Steve. It's really great to see the Chair of the—It just scared me there!

---

It's really great to see you joining us and our community always appreciates very much being able to fire questions at you. I think I'll just let you say a few words and then we'll just open the floor.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you Olivier. So I wandered in here a few minutes ago and I was trying to pick up the drift of what the conversation was about. I don't have all of it but I got two elements at least. One was the energy and the fire behind the conversation and the other seemed to be the level of support and orderliness of the process and so forth, which actually resonates strongly with some other things that are going on.

Throughout the whole organization, and most particularly I could speak about the Board, we too want to get a calendar, want to get some sense of order. We're beginning to try to characterize each of the retreats so we have three per year, is having a particular focus with the next one on strategic planning, trying to get the workload of the board committees laid out and various other things.

So there's a gradual movement. Fadi brings a tremendous amount of discipline to the management process, which is very helpful. It's taking a little longer that I would like to get there, but we are in fact getting there. The other thing is the completion of the recommendations from ATRT 1.

As is very natural, there is a presentation from staff that everything was done and maybe a slightly different assessment when viewed from the outside. Olivier and I are both on ATRT 2, and one of the top questions

---

on ATRT 2 is the recommendations in ATRT 1 carried out? So this is not getting lost, this is getting attention.

The other thing I want to comment about, somebody left and nobody picked up the ball and so forth. That's the kind of thing that catches my attention. I don't want to micromanage but we try to actually raise the temperature a little bit on things like that so that there is clarity in the management structure about the tasks that are taken on and making sure that those kinds of things don't just get lost.

So I'm very empathetic. I don't want to waste a lot of time on it here. Actually we're still running a very tight schedule this morning. You guys are and I have my own. So I'm ready to jump in on whatever you want.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steve. Evan had a question which he raised with Dev just before and I thought it would be appropriate to raise it with you right away. So Evan Leibovitch and then I'll operate the cue.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: But it was Carlton.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Evan or Carlton? Who wants to—?

MALE: Both of them probably.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

One of the things—Well, actually there were two points I raised with Dev, but one is more appropriate but the other one might be worth dealing with if we’ve got some time. The first one had to deal with something that came out of the social that we have between ALAC and the Board earlier in the week.

I had a conversation with multiple Board Members on the IGO/NGO issue, specifically the fact that the ALAC from day one has advocated for the splitting of the Red Cross and the [IOC 00:21:52] that we thought that they needed to be treated differently, that they both had different public interest issues, and that we really thought it was doing a disservice to the GNSO and the rest of the community by lumping them together for consideration.

Then ALAC has been from day one in favor of splitting them. The surprising thing was finding out from not one, but at least three of the people I talked to, that the board wasn’t even aware of the ALAC opinion on this, and especially from one person that said, “Well, I had always had a snaking suspicion that this should have been split, that this was an issue, but I didn’t think we had any support on the community for this and had I known it might have given me more courage to say something about it.”

Part of this ends up being a matter of how do we best define what gets to you in terms of making sure that this doesn’t happen again? Because it sends back a frustrating message. It’s one thing to have a feeling that you’re tossing policies over the world and you’re tossing advice over the world and nothing comes back.

---

It's even worse when it turns out that your advice had have been considered might have had a very concrete effect. What can we do going forward to prevent this from happening again? Do we have to do our own triage of what's important to us and what isn't? Is it a process thing or is there something getting in the way?

STEVE CROCKER:

I want to give you a full answer to this, which is going to cover on a bunch of things and [00:23:28], some of more complex picture. I don't know whether to do it on the spot here or to hold it for a second and see if there is other things that I can unfold into the same story that I want to tell you.

CARLTON SAUMUELS:

This is Carlton, for the record. Maybe because I was wondering there is a process vote which the elect statements get to the Board. One of the things that we've been seeing that when I show how the Board is advised, whether or not it's a summary that is sent to the Board or the statements themselves are sent as they are transmitted from us, and maybe if we knew a little bit more about that [I know what 00:24:14] they were sending in summary we could be more helpful to people say, "Well, that's not quite what we said," etc.

I'm just wondering whether or not there's a point in the process where we might be able to intervene say, "These issues are more important to us than others and therefore they should be flagged this way."

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. I'm having issues of a déjà vu on that question. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Alan Greenberg speaking. Steve, you mentioned dropping the ball on things and that's something that catches your eye. I have to say over the last couple of years it happens a lot. As an example, which may be of minor interest to you, the Board, I think it's part of an ATRT 1 recommendation or not, I don't remember, decided to put together a roster of all Board resolutions and what the status was, or at least the place to find them all.

If you go to the page that has that, at least as of a week or so ago, the top of the page says, "It's a big job. We only got to 2010." The actual data is 2011. It's now 2013, the staff member person who was responsible moved on. Her job title is still there under her old job title, but the work wasn't reassigned. So that very valuable resource has no meaning at all—

STEVE CROCKER: Who was that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Denise.

STEVE CROCKER: I see.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: When she was transferred on to staff, that was the task assigned to her. But when she went on, no one else took on at least. I have a number of times I've said, "Gee, the Board did something in 2012, I don't remember exactly when." It would have been real nice to have that list but it's not there. And even the heading of the list even corresponding with what's in the data.

STEVE CROCKER: Point taken.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's an example. There is many of them.

STEVE CROCKER: On that specific thing, and whatever other specific things to come. I was looking around to see what the best pathway is for to make sure we don't lose again. Let me ask would you gather those and work out the communications later, but your point's very valid.

ALAN GREENBERG: That particular one that I told is already on the radar and is going to be addressed.

STEVE CROCKER: If we're going err, I'd prefer to err on the side and having the same message twice as opposed to losing it once when we get to the one that doesn't fit on.



---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: To turn the heat to maximum level, I will have bring out the please.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm Rinalia Abdul Rahim for the transcripts. I'm not sure that I'm the one who always ask the really hard questions. Steve, I was listening to the ATRT 2 meeting, day one, part one. Only day one, part one because day one, part two was not posted on time. I was following it real time and then I checked again later on a few days later and, well, nothing much was up.

Then afterwards I saw a link with things posted. The point that I want to make is that is not enough to have things just posted, it needs to be done in a structured way. I just want to make sure that someone pays attention to how things are categorized, etc. That's just one point.

My question to you, which is separate to that, is that on one of the things that you said on day one, part one, was about the Board and its rule and how the Board's focus is on process and about making sure that processes are followed in policy development, etc. within ICANN.

When it comes to policy, you would to prefer not to deal with that, you would prefer the community to do that. But if you are put in a position to do it, would you be doing that as the Board? And I just want a confirmation if that was the case. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. I think I have enough to hold forth for it. On the first point, my memory is not perfect on this, but I have a vague recollection, and maybe Olivier remembers that there were some issues of a glitch in our

---

transcription process or something. I don't remember if there was something happening. Do you remember anything being said while we were in session on that day?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Steve, I do. The recording for the second morning I believe never got made. I think the afternoon was captured. I'm not sure—

STEVE CROCKER: So I don't remember precisely, but I remember there was some issue, maybe online or maybe it was distinct from that. We should look into that and make sure that it goes as smooth. I don't think there was an intent issue and certainly there was quite a bit of support from staff and facilities and so forth. So if there's a kink there that we need to work out, we'll do that.

Apologies if there was something broken about it. Let me come back to the original discussion about IOC versus Red Cross and use that to cover the broader issues about ALAC advice and about our role and so forth. It's a complicated ball of wax. I'm going to try to tease it apart.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You are in the queue.

STEVE CROCKER: The issue of the protecting the names is very heated, very hot topic. There is multiple layers of issues. Probably one of the most important is there's a question of turf of ownership. The GAC has given advice about

---

what they think should happen with those names and further said in effect, and I know this is being transcribed and I can look a little harsher than perhaps I should choose, but basically they said, “Not only are we giving you this advice but you have no right to listen to anybody else.

We have spoken. That’s the end of the story,” filled in with, “We have treaties. We have national laws. These are protected names of”—there’s a lot of history here. The Board, for reasons which I will come back to, said to the GNSO, “What do you think about this?” The GNSO said, “Oh, this is our territory.

These are names that are going to be within, so we are going to go into a full scale consultation process on this.” The game was on because now they have the GAC unhappy that the GNSO is involved at all, and the GNSO is saying, “Thank you very much but it won't take this long.” Now I hear ALAC sitting on the side saying, “Hey, what about us?”

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Alan and I have both been in the IGO/NGO working group of GNSO.

STEVE CROCKER:

I want to touch on a couple of different things with respect to this in particular activity. There is a, both the content, particular subject issue of the treatment names and a process issue of who has priority, what is the role, who gets to speak, where do people fit in the process, your raising question about where does ALAC advice fit into all of this. Let’s step back and look at it from a broad perspective.

---

Multi-stakeholder system we got to have everybody's voice in there, we got to have all the advice recorded and dealt with it in some fashion, we got to have even if advice is advice is not accepted or position is not accepted, there ought to be argumentation that explicitly responds to that relevant just not showing up in the transcript or whatever.

In my personal view, we're frankly not quite there yet because we have got, in this particular example, three completely distinct organizations. We got the classic stovepipe situation in which there isn't a natural leading together except as you said, for just put it in those discussions. I guess I have to ask where you absolutely express those views. What happened when you expressed those views?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Nothing.

STEVE CROCKER: So there are two forms of nothing. Did they get rejected or did they just get ignored?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, Steve, this is Evan. Do you mean within the GNSO working group?

STEVE CROCKER: Yes.

---

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Alan's been deeper involved than me. My personal feeling about that is that that working group is getting bullied by the outside. You have huge interventions from the Red Cross lawyers, from the [IOC 00:33:45] lawyers, and sometimes in the meetings, I mean, they take a part of the time talking. It's very difficult.

STEVE CROCKER: So it's another dynamic to be dealt with.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: For a complimentary view by Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: In the drafting team that came up with the original request months and months ago the issue was raised they did not have enough traction. It was one of the ones that was eliminated early in the process of various ways to move forward. In the current working group the [IOC 00:34:15] and Red Cross have been separated in terms of analysis, but how will that come out in the final recommendation and definition?

STEVE CROCKER: I have spent a little tiny bit of time trying to get a sense of what the variety of issues are with respect to these. My take on this, this is my sort of regurgitation or digest of the various things, is that there's broadly three classes of names.

That there's international governmental organizations' ideals, NGOs, non-governmental organizations, and then there is this special class of

---

super-NGOs in the way in which Red Cross and [IOC 00:35:02] are alleged to be the primary or perhaps sole occupants of that class and different treatments associate with each those names.

If you read the GAC Communicate that just came out, you see that the GAC is giving strong advice about protecting the IGO names. I guess they acknowledge and in prior discussions there's sort of a clear question of so what does it actually mean to protect the names, because we want to know, "Was that translated to this list of acronyms. What is that list of acronyms?"

If you look at the list of acronyms there's some serious issues because some of them are calling multi-used and so it's a little hard to imagine why you would protect that acronym as opposed to some other common word. The Board is not going to get into making those decisions.

What we're going to do is make sure all of that gets prosecuted in some fashion that is sensible and may not be to liking of anybody, but we certainly are not going to hold courtesy, "Oh, we like this one, and we don't like that one." It wouldn't be slippery slope but be a deep [00:36:29] that we just jumped into.

My broad point here just to sort of be able to move on is that this particular issue of the treatment of those names is tied up in a bigger ball of wax, which is that we are trying to tease apart. That said, there is absolutely no reason why your point of view shouldn't be heard and dealt with.

---

I can't guarantee that your position is going to prevail, and even if it did prevail, I'm not sure exactly what the result would be out of all of that. Let me touch on a, perhaps an easier and more mechanical issue. You raised the question of how is ALAC advice get to the Board. This is something for which both know a lot, and I know enough.

The part I don't know enough is I actually don't have a clear picture in my mind of having seen ALAC advice per se in a form that is sent to the Board and is a direct action. This is a weakness on my part. I don't know what the facts are, so it's not a complaint or a criticism at all. I'm just telling you that I'm not aware.

However, I have dealt with what should be, what I think of is an exactly parallel situation. When I was Chair of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, which is structured to give advice to the Board, and in fact—I'm sort of taking of my Board Chair hat and I want to talk about my experience as a SSAC Chair.

In my SSAC experience goes back to the founding of SSAC so I was there and was Chair during the formative period when there was nothing, there's just a bunch of people there to figure out what to do.

One of the very first thing we decided was that we would give advice to the Board when they ask, and even if we weren't asked we would give advice to the community, that we would poster ourselves as slightly apart and have a certain conscience of our own.

Let me give you the very personal aspect, when SSAC was constituted, which was a sequence of events following from 9/11 actually, most of the members were recruited and then I was asked if I would Chair it,

---

which is a slightly odd position to be in, and so I said to myself, “There’s a bunch of people and now I’m supposed to Chair them.

I’d better go talk to them and see and build at least a minimum relationship.” So I made a point of having individual conversation with every one of the people that have been selected, independently so there wasn’t a group discussion, and a variety of different things came out.

But there was a particular thing that was fairly common which was an engrained suspicion about ICANN, which its view is very political, and a desire to be helpful, and acknowledge that security and stability was important but a desire for somehow maintaining their own integrity and the integrity of this process without getting drawn into the politics so much. It was a repeated thing.

Out of that it became clear to me that we needed to hold ourselves a bit separate and speak with our own conscience, and not necessarily just stand there and wait to be told, “We want you to focus on this problem.” We can identify the problems ourselves, and so we developed a tradition of that.

Over time, we formalized the process. We wrote reports, the reports had over time more and more structure with findings and recommendations, some feedback from previous Board Chair, “When you send this to us don’t just tell us what you think, but also tell us what you think ought to be done because we have no capability at the Board level only than to turn them around and send them to somebody and say, ‘You should do this.’”



---

So there was some shaping of the recommendations over time to make them actionable. My question to you, how much of that matches what you do? Is your advice packaged and forwarded to the Board or does that feel like the right thing? I don't want to impose it particularly. It doesn't have to be a cookie cutter template; I'm just telling you how we solved the problem from ASAC when faced with what feels to me a comfortable situation.

I can tell you a successful that it does get to the Board and the Board read them and do something with them, even though we operate at this sort of tissue thin layer of attention span. This has triggered a few responses here.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Steve. Well, actually I don't think you can answer that because you're not the one who sends the statements at. Our statements are sent to the reply comment person in charge. There used to be a time when they are also carbon copied to the Board Secretary and for distribution to the Board.

There was a time when the Board Secretary just put them into bin. There was a time when the Secretary actually sent it to the Board. Some of our members are concerned that the Board was being flooded by too much of our advice. I'm really sorry that we do so much work, but this is that we cannot seem to find the right balance between too much, not enough, and actually getting our message through.

I would like to add one more thing, when Fadi yesterday, at the end of the public meeting, says he would make sure that each and every

---

question that has been asked at the microphone will be answered, perhaps the ALAC should actually take all of the statements since the Toronto meeting and hold the microphone for the whole length because if that's the only way the ALAC can get an answer—

STEVE CROCKER:

What we'll be able to do is to get it [doubled 00:42:54]. But you said you've turned them in their comment process. What I described has nothing to do with the comment process, these are documents that are sent from ASAC as an advisory committee to the Board and they have a structure and status of their own not in response to some public comment period that's open.

There are some actually SSAC documents, in fact they are stated as comments, that are in response to some particular thing. But they have a status and structure all of their own, they're not just another contribution into the public comment process. I don't want to deprecate the public comment process; we are committed as a quite separate matter of making sure that things that do go into the public comment process do not fall into black pools.

There is a very strong pressure to change that process and be much more forthright about dealing with them and assiduous about making sure that everything is answered, even in the negative, but not just left alone.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

I'm mindful there is a queue, Jean-Jacques, you were next in the cue. Is this a follow-up on the discussion we're just having with Steve?

---

JEAN JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques. Two points. I know the processes and some of them are more efficient than others. So simply for the sake of efficiency I would say that during my two terms on the ALAC, and I'm into my second one, I found that the most efficient one has been letter from Chair of ALAC to the Chair of the Board.

It has worked each and every time. It has attracted your attention. In most cases you have answer, you have taken the time to answer in written form and there was a follow-up. So I don't see why this would not be done either packaging by Olivier of certain, let's say two or three major points which the ALAC thinks is really important, or individually letter per subject, I don't care.

Actually, what I'm saying to you both is that I don't care what form it takes. I simply have found that the letter form has always been the most efficient. But I'd like to take up the second point, and I'm in your hands Olivier because my point is not about this to-ing and fro-ing, it's a more general question.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Steve is overdue. We'll go through the quick list and then we'll come back to you if we have just a minute. We've got Evan, Tijani, Carlton.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Actually the cue is long enough, I'll just see to other people. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Tijani.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. I remember, Steve, that we have this exact discussion in Toronto with the same word. You gave your experience and you work in group you said exactly the same. I understand why we are repeating it because nothing evolved.

I remember that I asked you if you want us to give you our advice in a template that you prefer, and you said, “No, send it in any form you want. There is no problem.” I think the problem is a problem of organization. Our advices should be sent to the Board and if it is in for the public comment, we have also to send it to the public comment.

Second point, we have to send it in a form that it shows it is ALAC, a short summary of our advice and our advice so that the Board member can understand and can choose an entry by issue or by constituency, and each time they will have a short summary that they can read.

I understand that they are very busy and that they cannot read everything, but if we give them in this form it will be, I think, possible. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Just a quick comment. When I was young and planning my career I had vast visions of great technical problems that I was going to solve. The single most successful thing that I’ve ever done was to hand out numbers one at a time on request for comments, but if you put a number on it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Steve. Next, Carlton and then Alan.

---

CARLTON SAUMUELS: [Inaudible 01:47:46].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Carlton. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Very quick comment. As Olivier said, we have gone through a period where we sent you every piece of paper we ever generated no matter what the subject was. We stopped that a while ago. Things that explicitly go to the Board right now are labeled advice, it's not called a communiqué, maybe we need to change the title.

Staff does a cover page to it with some general format, maybe that distracts people, they never get to the second page with the substance.

STEVE CROCKER: With all due respect to staff, which is extraordinarily good, my counsel to you more drawing from prior experience is make it your product that you're comfortable with. The form of it, I mean, staff is going to help but they're going to help format it have it come back to you and it be your product that comes and then send it formally over and then we'll receive it and we will respond it.

We have and we are expanding our tracking mechanism at the Board, and I can tell you that if something comes in that says, "This is a formal document from ALAC to the Board," it will get dealt with it expeditiously. At worst we will say, "You sent us the wrong advice so we can't deal with it because it's an inappropriate thing," but we won't just let it fall on the floor.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted and thank you. Staff need to format the document. The front page shows what the process was to reach that statement. Some statements have a summary, some statements don't. The fact is that some statements don't appear to be read at all.

STEVE CROCKER: You touched a hot point here. We have a syndrome throughout the entire organization of being so focused on process that it is extremely hard to find the content inside. Not just in this conversation, but repeatedly trying to do everything we can to get the content in the front page and if there has to be some documentation that we followed this process.

We did all that, put it on the second or third or tenth appendix because it's fundamentally serves no useful purpose up to protect oneself and document. We have this problem with resolutions; we have this problem. Anyway, it's a serious problem.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Finally, Jean-Jacques and then we will let you go. And well Sebastien, of course, I cannot overrule you, that's fine. Jean-Jacques and then Sebastien.

JEAN JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks. This is not about process. My question to you, Steve, is about one of the Board Committees. You may remember that it took me two and a half years to get it actually recognized an operation, which was the global partnerships. Because I think that most of us on the Board

---

agreed at that time that there should be some sort of oversight by the Board on the institutional and international dimension of ICANN.

I'd like to ask you what is your feeling just now, of course the fact that we do have a very active and very able new CEO does change the picture of it, but I would still like to know if you think that there is a necessity for some sort of Board oversight in contribution.

If so, what is that committee doing? Because I read very carefully all the available material from that committee online and, well, it's been very much for sure and not for substance.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. You touched on one of the big things which is that we are in a new era, a new season to borrow [01:51:38] with a significant change in the organization, a significant change in the amount of energy and so forth. It is not clear what, from the Board's perspective, what level of oversight, what level of involvement in the committee, and in fact is not just the Board global relations committee that is on the table for being thought through, but in fact across the whole committee structure we had a retreat in last fall.

We began to touch on the subject and one of the illuminating things was that Bruce, whose the Chair of the Board Governance Committee, listed all the committees, but he listed it in two columns and one column more the sort of usual committees that you have in any kind of corporate structure, audit, finances, so forth, and the others were the ones that were peculiar special to ICANN subject matter thing, so BGRC, IANA, and so forth.

---

We need to reexamine what the balance is between Board activity and staff activity. I don't want to say how it's going to come out or where we are going to do that but we recognize that there is a question marked there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steve. Finally, Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Just a pause by the previous discussion, first one, one of the difficulty we face is the liaison of the Board from ALAC disappeared and there is nobody to [understand] this task. This time I'm a little bit doing that. I am fired by my colleague because I am just coming from this committee; I am not to learn to do that.

For a very specific project I have this very problem that if I come and say that there's a project from ALAC, I will put in danger the project and I try to get out of that as much as possible. I don't think it's good, but it's the situation. That explains one part of the problem. The second, I am not sure that I get what Alan says that you have put advice on some of your statement.

My impression, and I may be wrong, is that there are a lot of statements but not advice to support. Then I would like to advise you to have some very important issue you want to bring to the attention to support, to advice. It will be easier to track, to push to say, "Hey guys, you are doing things for GAC, you are doing the same for SSAC, but you are not doing things for ALAC."



---

Today I can do that because it's, I would say just. It's not because it's better, but it statements, and very often statements and good statements to participate as a comment period, and those comments are taken into account.

I just want to remind you there's a meeting discussion about the fact that we wanted to change the number of meetings per region and your statement among all these pushed about to the side not to fulfill this way of doing the meeting and we organized a meeting as a working group where you are participating. Then I think you need to try to what is more important to you.

I know everything it's important, but there are sometime in question is more important than the others and transform and to an advice. For again, we just have one advice, one communiqué from the each meeting, and we have it three times a year.

It's easy to undone, everybody knows about that. For the moment nobody in ALAC if I ask you, where's your last advice and how we - that's my suggestion, nothing else than a suggestion. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Let me just...if I might. I tend to shy away from the idea of that you have to prioritize because that's code work for "you have to give up on some things" and I don't really like that approach. If you want to give advice on something then it's important enough that we should listen.

There may be banned with issues, there may be resource issues, in which case we would deal with that as necessary, but we should not sort of foreclose that at the beginning. But I would say to sort of bring

---

all this up a little bit, put yourself in our position just as you would in talking anybody else or trying to give advice.

Build a model of what's going to happen when it comes in. We're not all that complicated. We are a Board of twenty people. We are not an operating body, we do not have the resources directly at our hand to go and task something. We have to hand broad advice to a management, to the CEO and the rest of the staff, and they are the ones that have to carry things out; or we send messages or ask advice of other bodies and so forth.

We are not very deep in that sense, we are very conscientious and we are very committed and we actually know a fair amount, but just postulate what's going to happen when your document comes on our desk, what are we going to do with it and figure out sort of how that should look and what would put us in the best position in doing what you want.

I'll give you a reasonable example from a different quarter. We got a document that says, "We think you should take note of the complexities of the following area." I sent back a polite, private note saying, "That doesn't give us very much information and we should do something about it."

I got back a kind of backchannel hot response, "The Board is interfering with our decision process." "If you want to play that game, that's fine. Send in that advice and we will send the same message back and we will do it formally in publicly and then you can decide what you want to do." I mean, it had to be sort of a sensible thing.

---

I would counsel give us something that we can deal with in an actionable way and we will try to do that. If it's too big, sort of what this [00:58:28] was about, then we are not going to be in a position to do anything about it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Steve I sent you a [00:58:35] due to time constraints. Do you wish to be let off the panel?

STEVE CROCKER: Yes, but I sense that there's a hot response waiting.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Not a hot response. Rinalia for the transcripts. Fadi said yesterday at the public forum, "The message all way has been bottomed up. Policy developed by bottomed up process sent to the Board, Board decides, whatever. If something is rejected it goes back."

My question again, which refers back to the one that I asked you, if you are in a position to be asked to make a policy for whatever reason, would you be prepared to do it?

STEVE CROCKER: I am going to duck because the form of the question is one that presumes has certain assumptions built into it. It's not quite as bad as "when did we stopped beating our wives?" But there is a sort of form to that. It gets wrapped up into "What's a policy and what's..." We do

---

occasionally make decisions which are driven by our sense of what's necessary to do.

I'll give you one of the most important one recently. We accepted the recommendations of the Who Is review team. We said, "All this has to be supported," and then the recommendation is implemented, but at the same time we know deep in our hearts that the WHOIS system is deeply broken, has been broken, and it's time to actually cause something different to happen, so we initiated a process. We did not say, "Here is what the fix is."

We did not say, "Here is our design and make these changes." What is going to happen is we will go through the whole process and involve everybody from the different segments and so forth. But we did say, "This is going to happen." Is that policy? I think it's quite arguably policy, full policy development process absolutely not. I mean, we said, "We are going to simply try to frame the question and then turn it back over to the GNSO PDP."

We do pay attention to whether the policy processes and so forth are working, whether they are stalled. So there are some times arguments whether we are interfering or taking a policy position when we are trying really to see whether or not that process is reaching some sensible conclusion or is being gained or whatever.

Despite the fact that many of us have quite good confidence in the subject matter, our primary focus is to make sure and ensure that the different parts of the system are working and to consider what is not working what is the right way to deal with that. Thank you. I hope that that's helpful.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you very much, Steve. When you mention [01:01:33] visions of roast peeking. Fantastic. Well, thank you so much for joining us and I hope that you will be able to see us again in Durbin in similar circumstances.

STEVE CROCKER: I do look forward to it. I apologize. Maybe we should do something on how much time we allocate, but...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It really depends on the time you have because we are told that sometimes you do have meetings on the Friday mornings, so you never know. We are never sure how much time you can spare with us.

STEVE CROCKER: This is meeting three and I've got at least two more to go, just to give you a [fair 02:02:04]. But if you say an hour, we will do an hour. I have no problem.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That is great. Thank you. Joining us at the table for more time, we actually have—and in matter of birds we can kill two birds with one stone.

FEMALE: Three.

---

**OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:** Is it three now? Who do you want to kill? They shall rename nameless. Xavier Calvez. Different sentence. It was a full stop. Xavier Calvez, Steve Antonoff and [Serine Louis] joining us at the table and welcome; and apologies for the delay, but as you've seen we had to roast the bird slowly. We are now basically dealing with travel issues, plus I guess issues of finance and human resources. Steve, you have the floor.

**STEVE ANTONOFF:** So you finally got to the real Steve. I know it took a little extra time but here we are. The real Steve please stand up. In difference from Steve Crocker who does an excellent job by the way? I wish I'd come into the room earlier because it's always interesting to hear them speak. I'll start by saying that I don't think anyone in this room came, only Tijani made it toward the end of the presentation on Tuesday.

I don't think anyone else in the room made it, which is quite all right. One of the things I announced on Tuesday was that I am relinquishing my responsibilities on my day to day basis for our constituent stakeholder travel. At the close of this meeting I will have completed my mission of transition.

And the day to day activity for constituents they call it travel is moving to Diane Schroeder. I think many of you know Diane. She's been with ICANN since 2000, has had worked virtually every position in the organization that one can think of, including a one time in the position of Xavier now, and that is of CFO.

So Diane is taking over administration, so all of the administrative activities that were on my plate are now moving to Diane, inclusive of

---

those activities is travel, which as a subset includes constituent stakeholder travel. So Diane is actually already operating in that role. She's not here in Beijing and we agreed that I would stand in one last time for these meetings.

In addition, part of the oversight of the administrative function is actually residing with Xavier now as well. He and Diane are working as a team in many of these matters. He is ably engaged as well in travel matters. It makes sense obviously because I can spend an extraordinary sum of money on an annual basis for travel, which is inclusive of constituent stakeholder travel but on a greater picture travel in general. Xavier and I will probably share the podium for any questions that may arise in this meeting.

I don't think I need to necessarily rehash everything we discussed in the presentation with the travel guidelines or currently posted, we are slowly but truly receiving public comment. It is my understanding through Tijani that the At-Large community is preparing a public comment, which will be more than welcome. We are keeping the public comment period open for an extended period of time.

I think our close date is around 11 of June if I'm not mistaken, to ensure that everyone has an opportunity to way in on their thoughts around the draft travel guidelines that are published. Then at the close of the public comment period the responses will be published as well as the final travel guidelines for FY 14. One of the things that is being discussed just generally speaking is that we will probably codify as an organization travel guidelines and not have them republished year over year over year.

---

We think we have now refined them to the point where they are probably reasonably static and to the extent that anything needs to be modified for a specific ICANN meeting, that will be published in a travel summary that comes out for that meeting, but the guidelines will be then the guidelines and only changed or amended or adapted over time as necessary. Alan it looks like you would like to weigh in.

ALAN GREENBERG: If the Chair allows.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, sure go ahead Alan---you've been nice today.

STEVE ANOTONOFF: That's about to end.

ALAN GREENBERG: You may have addressed my question with the last issue unless of course this current travel summary is the base for that going forward; and I'm not going to talk about specifics---we can talk about them in detail. We always welcome changes which say we're going to do more things and give you more money or more travelers or pay more days or whatever---thank you we appreciate it.

We don't appreciate when we have gone through long, painful discussions to add a---and I'll say---privilege; and then suddenly it just disappears based on some edict which is not discussed with us ahead of time for which no rationale is given. I am sure there is a rationale in



---

some cases, and in some cases it's a typo, who knows; but it is exceedingly frustrating when every single time these things come out, something has slipped out through the cracks that was hard won, or hard discussed at least.

I, for one, am tired of doing the same things over and over again. I can give specifics if you care about this particular one, but the general concept---I hope I am getting a message through.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Xavier?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Alan and I discussed this subject---it is sad but I can't even remember if it was today or yesterday. Both. Thank you! So I think this, without going into the details either; for one Steve, I know what Alan is referring to and we can follow up together to be able to verify what Alan sees.

We'll do that, but leaving that aside, I am reading what Alan says from the perspective of what is happening or is not happening on an on-going basis from a process standpoint that should be fixed so that Alan doesn't have to say what he says.

My point is that we need to really look at the structure of the communication and the reporting that we do of the travel, so that you don't have any questions other than, I don't agree, can you do something else?

But at least you have the information as to what the process is and why what is published is the way it is, so that you don't have to at least

---

wonder if it's a typo or not---I mean, the fact that you have to wonder whether it is a typo or not means that you don't know how the number has been determined, how it came up and how it has been established and communicated.

Steve, I think, pointed out something that we have discussed internally-- -have not yet defected---which is aiming a bit at trying to sort that type of issue out. Right now, we have guidelines that are combination of policy and logistics really, we're trying to address logistics.

What we think we should be doing is split the policy aspect and make them a bit more solid and permanent, and address the logistical aspects as they are on a fairly ad-hoc basis---not commingle the two in a manual document that is a bit of both and not necessarily very clear as to what.

So it has had its purpose and its rationale and its use, but we looks as if we are getting towards a maturity level that can use a different approach. What I think we also need to improve as a result of that is how we communicate this---I think there may be a bit more clarity on the process that needs to be defined.

Also, the timing of communication, so we have the budget approval process.

It concludes at a certain time and I think that there is communication that should happen right after the approval of the budget process to recap the travel funding that's been granted on by an organizational basis and, in total, probably there is also a reporting or communication-- -or combination of that---that needs to happen down the road, throughout the year---maybe on a meeting-by-meeting basis--- that

---

allows you to understand how many travelers have been effectively funded, and maybe a recap at the end of the year.

So I think there is more thinking that we need to do about the communication and structure of communication of the travel process. Today, we are going to be working on that, with also Steve's guidance in experience sharing.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Xavier---back to Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, just a follow up. There is also a mechanical part that needs to be fixed; you actually have to post these documents. If you go to the travel page, the last Travel Summary that is posted is The Draft for Fiscal Year 12. We are a bit pass that.

Now, I pointed out that it is not just travel; there are lots of documents that I put out for draft, comments are made, and the final one never gets posted, ever, until you start extracting it from staff somehow. For the travel ones that are particularly visible, let's keep the documents up to the earmark.

STEVE ANOTONOFF: Yes, apologies for that. I did not realize that the summary was not posted; I do know that the summaries get sent down to the travelers once their names are nominated, because that's who it typically applies to for a particular meeting. I don't disagree with you, however, that the summary should be posted. Are you talking about the guidelines Alan?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I am talking about the things called The Travel Summaries---the documents we are debating right now.

STEVE ANOTONOFF: So there are two kind of sister documents, if you will. One is a document we call The Travel Guideline which is supposed to be an overarching of policy-type document that describes, generally speaking, what Constituency called The Travel Works. We want to codify that, so that it is not a moving target every year, so that it is just not an FY14 or an FY15, it's just The Travel Guidelines---and if it is amended five years from now, it becomes Version 2.

That's one document and that should be posted on the website. The draft for FY14 is currently up and the final version would then go up in its place. The other document is something that we call The Travel Summaries; that document, when it is published, is sent to each individual traveler by name. I don't know if you want that posted as well---I think it should be, but that's a different story.

ALAN GREENBERG: The Travel Summaries are religiously posted in all languages and they are up to date--if I said "summary" before, that's a verbal typo. The Travel Summaries are posted and Beijing is there and all its glorious languages. It's the other one that.....

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The summaries are correct; it's the guidelines that are not. Point 1.

---

STEVE ANOTONOFF: One noted.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Jean Jacques, I realize you had your hand up for a while, but I did say I would give preference first to ExCom members, so Tijani Benjamin is next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier, thank you Steve to be here and thank you for the years that you served in Constituency Travel. I think that despite all the critics that we are doing every year, you did a very good job, you and your team; so I cannot miss to thank you and thank your team.

Second point, I think that the system will evolve in the future since the decision to automate the treatment of the data of Constituency Travel. It will be done after these consultations---it is a very long time, the period of public consultation, that will bring the point of view of the community and I hope that those point of views will be taken into account so that the final guideline would reflect the point of view of the whole community.

I think that one of the most important things that must be done in the future with this new platform is that the parameters of each meeting should be discussed with each Constituency Chair and the Constituency staff, because they are the only people who know about the activity of this Constituency during this meeting.

So if you do that in this way, and if you take into account the comments that we did that we voted yesterday on our statement, you would have

---

it very soon. I propose, Olivier that we send it both to the public, and to Diane---the Constituency document--- so that we are sure that our point of view is reaching the staff.

If this is done and if for each meeting the parameters are decided on in very close consultation with the leadership of Constituency and the staff of Constituency, we will not complain anymore because everything will be automatic and will be well done --

Only one thing, which is The Itinerary. This is something that cannot be automated, since it depends on our lives, it depends on a lot of things.

So for this particular point, we need a flexibility that doesn't impact more money. We never ask for anything that will impact more money, we are asking for flexibility. When you say, "What else---don't speak about," we don't have flexibility, because sometimes we will make you make money from our ticket, but we have to pay one night more; so this is the flexibility we are asking for.

In general, I think in future it will be better. What is good is that you listen to us---I hope you will take into account our points. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. I know Xavier had put his hand up to provide you with a response.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Actually, with a question, because I didn't understand well what Tijani was pointing out when he mentioned implementation of a platform and

---

automation. So can you be precise, and then I have another question after that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Automation for me is putting everything into an application, and change only parameters for each meeting, so that the treatment of the data of the travel and the accommodation will not be, if you want, treated every time. It will be treated by the application but according to the parameters of this specific meeting.

STEVE ANOTONOFF:

Thank you Tijani, that's an excellent suggestion. We actually made an attempt to create a data base a few years ago. It was home grown, if you will, it was using internal software development resources. The data base was very cumbersome and in fact created more work and not less, and so we abandoned the project with our new Vice President of IT.

In fact, we've had multiple discussions with him and ICANN is applying a company-wide system that will serve any number of purposes but includes the capability of doing what you are asking for. Olivier, just to clarify there is a lot of information we request from travelers for every meeting, and they are looking to have that just codified so they wouldn't have to keep resupplying passport data, home information, banking information.

The only thing that's new or novel for a meeting is the specific itinerary and dates for that meeting and the rest of the information is already codified---if I'm understanding, Tijani, what you are saying.

---

**TIJANI BEN JEMAA:** Yes, and I may add that this application you will, for example, codify that the first working day the traveler will come one day before, and the last working day, the traveler has to leave one day after. If the time between the arrival and the work is less than X hours we have to add a day.

This is what I mean, so you will not have the headache every time to say, "No, it's too much!" No, it's not too much, it is according to this parameter that you put.

**STEVE ANOTONOFF:** Thank you Tijani. We had an instance 1159 and the meeting starts at 7:00 a.m. and it's just..... Xavier?

**XAVIER CALVEZ:** I just wanted to ask the question and you clarify, because Tijani firmly did it in a way that seems to be a done deal and a tomorrow thing, and we have not had more than a five-minute conversation with the staff on the subject.

So there is just an implementation gap that I wanted to make sure is clear for everyone; it is not that we are implementing something tomorrow---we need to think about it, we need to design it, we need to develop it, and we need to implement it---so it is not going to be immediate, is my point.

What you and I had discussed is concept at this stage which I think we need to go down the path of---there is no question about it---what Steve has indicated. It has been tried in the past, and we are going to



---

try it further, and there is a good question of are we going to try to really tie that travel data basing system even to the schedule?

I mean, if we know that the ALAC meets on the Friday until 11:00 then we know when the travelers that are funded need to be there until, at least, so then we can start integrating some of the data. This is all a lot of good ideas and at this stage, it is---I don't want to say speculations, because we do have the plans to build a data base and automate, but there is not much more than that yet.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Xavier. Tijani has related essentially what is in our statement, so you will be receiving all this in writing. Steve and then I've got Evan. Jean Jacques, you are still there but unfortunately they are also talkative.

STEVE ANOTONOFF: So I'll pass the mike because Xavier actually got to the point I was also going to make.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, the point I was going to make is exactly the opposite of automating, and it is a matter of the human component, i.e. is there any way to give folks like Joseph a little bit of slack in their dealing with us. Occasionally, you come across things, e.g., giving a person one more day of hotel means they get a cheaper airfare because the airline doesn't fly there every day of the week.

---

These kind of things happen and the kind of thing that Tijani is talking about with the 1159---maybe a little bit of human commonsense and a little bit of trusting folks, like Joseph, to be able to make calls like that. That's the entire opposite of just having things in the data base and having explicit IT rules applied to them.

So is there is a way of maybe combining a bit of the two---yes, you have this data base; yes you have this policy, but yet there is a bit of human component to this as well. Thanks.

STEVE ANOTONOFF:

We actually have those types of exceptions in the past, just to be clear without disclosing. There is one person in this room for whom we have done that in the past, where we have actually done two additional nights of hotel in exchange for a dramatically reduced airfare.

When it makes sense, we clearly do that, and so we do look at those on a case-by-case basis and have made those types of exceptions; so there is a human touch. I think one of the bigger challenges that we have had is the volume has moved from---when I first started moving 40 people to an ICANN meeting, Joseph moved well in excess of 200 people to this meeting; I think its final number was close to 230.

So it's a matter of skill ability which was one of the reasons we wanted to get the guidelines codified because as we scale off---and it's only going to get bigger and not smaller---we need to have it be able to work for the best majority of people in a uniform and in a consistent and fair and equitable manner.

---

I know that Xavier has been in discussion with Diane and Joseph about resourcing issues and I think they are aggressively looking at what can be done to ensure that we don't lose that interpersonal touch between ICANN's constituents they call The Travel Group, and the travelers, because Joseph will get overwhelmed otherwise.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Just to say that things have got a lot better lately. When I first came into ICANN, it was very, very, very regimented, and then starting with Matt and moving on to Joseph, things have been getting better. So it's more of, "Keep up the good work."

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, thank you Evan. Xavier?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Quickly, a personal view; automation has nothing to do with, in my view, with flexibility and managing exceptions. It only has to do with reliability and efficiency--in my view---so what we intend to is automate because we need to scale.

At 215 travelers which is where we are, we cannot have 215 ad-hoc situations. So we need rules, we need policy and we need tools so that we can do a better customer service. What I want Joseph to do is stop booking trips; I want him to be able to understand what are the situations of the various trips.

I want him to do quality control; I want him to do Exception Management, not booking trips. We need automation to be able to do

---

that, because I don't want to hire five people in travel, and then six, and then seven as it grows. So that is the approach that we want to try to do.

Now, to be clear, I am not making promises that we are going to look at all the cases all the time and say, "Yes, so let us work on that." We are going to try to do a good customer service but we are going to have heart conversations in the future because, I tell you, I want to make sure we have policy---we have a travel policy that is clear, that is solid, that tries to address as much as possible with precise rules so that we minimize the exceptions, but that means that we need also to be able when we do that exercise of policy definition, to ensure that we optimize the service to our customers which are all of you---and by the way, all of us---because the travel policy is the staff travel policy as well.

I want to have one policy ideally that addresses maybe different population like the board, like the staff, but having more policy that is solid, that is intangible; unless we all as a group determine that there are obsolete aspects to it, or unclear aspects to it, or things that were not necessarily determined in the past and are now necessary to determine.

We need to be able to scale for quality management, and exception management, so that we overall increase the customer service. So to me automation is for that purpose and in my view exactly if we try to be able to address everything that you, Evan, said or Alan said, or others---Tommy as well---we need to be able to get out of the management of the volume and the complexity crippling our ability to serve you correctly. This is my point.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Xavier and it is good to see that you are looking at scaling things up. My solution would have been that I can create it to an airline, but maybe not something to consider right now.

XAVIER CALVEZ: You are talking about a private jet I suppose?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The 747 type---we do have a large community, we can't settle for a little, small thing.

STEVE ANOTONOFF: Talking about our own airline, we have acquired a number of used DC3's from some of the inter-African countries [laughter] and.....

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'll fly regular airlines, thank you. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. I like what Xavier said just now, I hope that it is implemented. On exceptions, management and flexibility, I would like to say for this particular trip, I would like to commend Constituency Travel on its exceptions management for the ISOS Malaysia representative.

We had a last minute replacement, the policy says we cannot accept any changes after a particular date, but an exception was made and I really appreciate that, because it was so important to have this delegate

---

here. Now to my question, Durban is around the corner---what is our level of preparation for that?

The last time I was in Africa for an ICANN meeting I got very sick and needed emergency attention, and in Dubai the minute I landed the paramedics had to come and get me. So what's happening?

STEVE ANOTONOFF:

I'll tell you what I do know, and that's probably not everything. The meeting's team first of all is obviously making arrangements to have a medical staff available---I saw them here at this meeting, e.g. they had a booth here, they had an ambulance outside the facility. In addition, ICANN now has a contract with a company called The International SOS, or ISOS, as it's fondly referred to.

Our contract with them covers the ICANN meetings so it does not cover each of you for your travel generally speaking, but it does cover your travel when ICANN has paid for it. So if we paid for your travel and you become ill, ISOS can intercede and find a medical treatment, so that we do travel to nations where finding what is fondly referred to ---and I apologize if some people don't agree with the term---as a more western-style Medical Treatment, or more advanced levels of medical treatment is probably a better way of saying it.

ISOS has contracts with those type of providers in almost every country in the world so they have them on immediate call. They can also handle extractions and that would be actually when you get to fly on the "private jet" from the host country back to your home country---if that ever becomes required.

---

You wouldn't be on a lie-flat seat but you would be lying flat the entire time [laughter]. So they do have an extraction methodology so ICANN now has a contract with this company called ISOS which sits in preparation for any ICANN supported travel worldwide, which includes the three ICANN meetings. So we have beefed up, if you will, our provisions for those types of situations.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: As long as the lie-flat seat is not a padded wooden box, I guess that's still okay. Just one quick matter, it's 11:56 a.m. and I have been told that the internet will go down at 12:02 exactly so if you have to write your mother or tell people that---you know, send an email to it now.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: The internet will go down here?

ALAN GREENBERG: We have been told that the rooms at the back will actually have internet today and tomorrow.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So we might have to---okay.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I have a follow up question, sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, follow up with Rinalia. We do also have several people who are....

---

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: When we were in Africa we were in a different hotel. The internet access was not available in the rooms, not consistent and I had difficulty getting communication out, so people didn't know that I was sick and I certainly couldn't get myself over to the main conference center to get medical attention.

I just want you to be aware so that next time I think you need to place these medical facilities in spots where people are accommodated as well. Thank you.

STEVE ANOTONOFF: Thank you. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Given what you have just said about this new medical contract, does this affect all the amount of third party medical insurance that we have to buy before engaging in an ICANN trip?

STEVE ANOTONOFF: It does not. I would strongly recommend that if you feel that you need third party medical insurance that you continue to acquire it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Jean Jacques?

JEAN JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks. I'll try to remember what my theme was---yes, Visas. It happens that around this table most people don't have Visa problems



---

because we come from countries that have arrangements with a whole set of other countries. That's true for the European Union and therefore for France.

I am very struck by the fact that during this meeting in Beijing several people talked to me about their problems, not only from Africa, but from non-European Union Europe, and from other places. So this is a point which cannot be solved by any degree of automation. It is a political point, therefore I request all six of you staff members here today to bring the message back to the appropriate level.

I think it is the duty---I used to think it would be an additional service by the CEO, but I think now it is his duty. In some cases where it is known that there will be a Visa problem, it is his duty to mention the thing when he does his preliminary visit.

He doesn't do that to every country, but for instance he came to China some two months ago or something, and in other cases it may be required---I think it will be the case in South Africa. So there must be a political intervention on the part of the CEO---or someone high up in the staff whom he delegates to the country---in the preparatory stage to point out this problem and to request very formally that there be special arrangements.

I have been saying this for five years, but I say it this time; I have waited for my turn in this meeting of the Executive Committee of which I am not a part, but I think it is very important, because I was struck by the fact that for instance, a friend from Pakistan, [name 29:22], told me that now in Pakistan names don't sound very U.S. or European, you see what I mean?

---

Well, in some cases they have to pay above \$100.00---translate that into local money and see how much that is. Applications, in some cases, must be made six months in advance so I cannot overstress the importance of this issue and ask you to pay political attention to this each time for each separate ICANN meeting. It takes a separate political approach. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jean Jacques. Steve, did you want to....

STEVE ANOTONOFF: No, I'll just say that is in order. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fantastic. Any other questions or comments from anyone? No. Sebastian?

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: I know that this subject is for me. Do you think that they will change between Toronto and Beijing in the handling of the Visa questions or no immediate action? You get trouble, all the same people who are not about to come, you'll get the same type of trouble; you'll get nothing way better. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

To answer your question, Sebastian. Those are not the same people who've got the same problems but there are problems for Beijing also. What I ask, you remember, Sebastian is that ICANN before deciding on a venue to make the country the local organizer commit to facilitate the inaudible 31:23 of Visa. This is the way IGF is doing and if all people are going to the IGF, there is no problem.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET:

I take it two seconds on my part as organizer in Paris. I could not have been able to help anybody about the Visa, because I was not in a Governmental organization. We can request, we can ask but it is not the Government that organizes the ICANN meetings. Once again, yesterday---if you heard well---the guy said he will take care the question of the Visa when he makes his presentation about Durban.

I hope that you he will do it but I was hoping that the fact that the Visa was on this time compared to Toronto, less people get outside of the travel than when they were here. Is it difficult to have Visa sometimes? Yes.

I can tell you also a lot of stories for a lot of people, but they finally get in---that's why it is more important than anything else, but I get your point; we'll still work on that. Thank you.

STEVE ANOTONOFF:

Thank you Sebastian. Without wanting to reopen the whole debate--- you have a jack use it.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Follow up, follow up, follow up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sebastian, it's true, it's not Government, it's not U.N. ---I understand, but we have local organizers, but local organizers generally do that in coordination with the Government, generally. I say generally---that's what happened in Africa, that's what happening here.

It is very simple, if the Government doesn't agree to make a special arrangement for Visa we go elsewhere--we are not obliged, even if we do all the meetings in a singular place that gives Visa; because it is about inclusion.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. I see a lot of faces and a lot of nodding heads around the table. So that's maybe a message to the Board, don't try to squeeze blood out of a stone.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: No, we will not get to Durban if it is what you are asking, because we could have trouble. We are working on the question of the Visa in advance to allow everybody to be able to get the Visa, but if you want that each time we go to a country we need to have first the blessing of the Government, we are not acting as going to a different country, and having a multiplied possible organization, not just the Government

---

organizing the meetings. Yes, here we have---but I can have the record tell you a bit about Durban.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I see Pacman arriving in the room---Sean, otherwise known as Pacman---is the one eating up our resources one bit by one bit. I think we do have to cut our discussion short, if we don't we will end up in our underpants and everything else being wheeled out to the containers that are flying back to the next meeting.

I have to thank you very much Xavier. Thank you very much Steven, thank you very much name 35:07. We hardly got a grading but we will have to try and do better next time, only next time it will not be you in the hot seat because you---will you be travelling to the next meetings as well?

STEVE ANOTONOFF: I will be travelling to some of the meetings but not necessarily all of them.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We wish you the best in your next position. Thank you.

STEVE ANOTONOFF: Thank you very much and it's been a pleasure to serve.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Please thank all your team.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, actually put it in the record to thank Joseph for the amazing work that he does. Occasionally, and I am aware that some of our members should add Joseph---he gets hit a few times and it is not fair. So really he has the appreciation of our community because would it not be for him we wouldn't even be here. That's kind of something that we do have to be very grateful for.

XAVIER CALVEZ: And if I may, he has an email address. If you want to show appreciation it is not very difficult and he certainly can use it---that he knows very well, even though it may not appear as such from the customer's stand point or user's stand point.

There is a huge amount of goodwill that Joseph puts into that and certainly the feedback that he gets is absolutely not in proportion of that amount of goodwill. The complaining ---as it has in the past---will also be handled by Joseph and I in the future.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Last words, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I just want to echo what Xavier just said. I am one of the people who do on occasion send letters of thanks to people and their managers and I have never had a response other than, "Thank you very much." No one ever does this, so please do it.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We really cannot stop talking here, can we? Go ahead Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I am suggesting an action item out of this. Is it possible, Olivier, for you to send a letter to name 37:42 thanking and showing appreciation, because it is one thing to send a letter to say "Thank you" and it is another thing to send a letter to your boss saying "This guy has gone above and beyond."

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: For the whole Constituency Travel staff and especially for Joseph.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Staff, is this an action item that you have recorded? Okay, super! Thank you and we haven't finished our meeting actually. The first thing we have to do is put our hands in the pockets and see how much we can bribe Sean to let us stay here for a few more minutes to finish that. We have done the review of the Beijing action items.

We just need to look at the next steps to Durban which are quite important. What are we looking to achieve until then? Durban is only three months away? Two and a half.

HEIDI ULRICH: Thank you. We have put this item on the agenda today because we are in particularly tight timeline between Beijing and Durban. I am sure that you'll refresh yourselves and regenerate yourselves as well as my hardworking staff, it's basically going to be end of April---or getting close

---

to the end of April---and that is basically two and a half months until Durban.

Matt has already put up the Durban meeting space, and I think this is really going to be a key action item for you to work on pretty quickly---the second we come back we need to start looking at Durban.

I am aware that there are many other activities that you are working on, so I have put this item on the agenda just so that we can have a brief discussion---we do have about 50 more minutes now before things start being packed--- to look at both the ALAC priorities, activities, as well as (AL) RALO's plans for Durban as the host.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Heidi. The first thing I remember off hand is the meeting with the ASO. One of the action items was to have another breakfast with the ASO, but this time also having our RALO leadership with us. We have broken the ice to start with---not that there was much ice---we've gotten to know each other and there was certain interest for the RALO leadership to be known and to be introduced.

Any other things that come to mind with regards to preparing our schedule over there, what we need to have, what is absolutely essential; what we could drop off if we didn't really need it. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Olivier. As it will be in Africa, we are thinking about organizing something different from what we did in Nairobi, what we



---

did in Dakar. In Nairobi we were the first that organized the show case and in Dakar we were the first who organized the inaudible building.

In Durban we organized something different and I hope you will appreciate it as you appreciated the other two things. I think that since it is a very short time, perhaps we need more efforts and perhaps we will ask the staff for more teleconferences and more engagement in the few next weeks.

**OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you very much. The look on Heidi's face---well, all the staff's faces---was priceless there. Next is Rinalia.

**RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:** Thank you Olivier. I would like for the ExCom at some point in our call to review the agenda for Beijing with respect to building the agenda for Durban, because as you said there are some items that have been useful and there are items that should be dropped off the table. I just want to say for my colleagues that I found the inaudible 42:41 briefing really good and I have reached out to them and said I would like more of this and the Chair has agreed that we should have a one-hour interaction with them next time.

I think that's really good, and if there are others that we feel should have this kind of treatment we should certainly put it on the table. I think that the Friday meeting perhaps needs to be a little bit longer because 9:00 - 11:00, and then people are coming taking away water bottles, etc., is annoying, it is not service oriented and I feel like we still have business. Thank you.

---

STEVE ANOTONOFF: Thank you Rinalia. I know that time passes very fast when you are having fun, but it is actually three hours already, 9:00 - 12:00. Do you want it a full day, we can do a full day if you want [laughter]. 10:00 - 1:00 is the same as 9:00 - 12:00. 9:00 - 1:00.....I had to use my fingers to count this one, four hours, okay. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Rinalia has already channeled for me with the exception of that last part.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Be a bit serious please, Alan's got the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I've found this meeting in many ways a better meeting than I've had in a long time from an ALAC point of view. Now, admittedly I missed a lot of the sessions and that may be a factor; but those that I was at I think things worked better than they have in a long time.

This is not the forum to go over it bit by bit, but I think reviewing the schedule saying what worked, what didn't, I think would be a very valuable use of the time either on an ALT or a super set---actually, the rules aren't in force yet, they are still ExCom. A comment to Tijani, although I am not sure I am a good candidate for this: To do other commitments, you don't only have to have people from the region working on whatever you are doing.

A smattering of other people who are really interested in working perhaps will taint it a little bit, I know, and won't be purely African, but I

---

think that's probably good for a whole bunch of reasons. On a personal comment; since life was said to come out of Africa it is reasonable that all our good ideas do also.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Carlton?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you Chair. For the record, I am going to be the skunk in the room. I am concerned that when we look at the schedules of people, we take into consideration the burden of our staff support. It really, as I look at it we are close to burn out with the staff that we have. I think that as we look at what we put on the plate we must keep in consideration the highest level of staff support that we have can only go so far.

They are not going to tell you they can't do it, that's the problem; but we need to be aware that we are asking people to work punishing hours, and we must moderate, ameliorate---whatever it is that we need to do to ensure that self-respect.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Carlton. From my point of view, having to work on all the different agendas that we've had this week in previous meetings and so on, I entirely agree that when we have ALSs in house--- in other words the (AP) RALO ALSs that came here, the RALO ALSs that came to Toronto---when we have all of these events, it crowds our agenda to a level which is probably not sustainable by our staff.

---

Of course, there are the ones who have to be at every single session; we can decide not to be but a 7:00 a.m. session does not start without at least one of our staff being there, if not two. A session finishing at 7:00 p.m. doesn't end until---so of course that really makes things absolutely crazy.

A normal ICANN meeting or an ICANN meeting without having our ALS meeting makes it a little bit more manageable. I'd like Heidi to kind of share some points of view on this, but this is the way that I've seen it from someone who works with you. I mean, the problem is that we cannot just not have ALSs come, I am looking forward to the possible summit next year.

Frankly, I don't think just your team would be able to sustain the summit, I am really sorry; so we would have to look at---in any case since we are scaling up---perhaps beefing up our resources; maybe not as a permanent beefing up of the resources but at least during the meetings---especially those meetings when we have ALAC instructors that are here, we might need a couple more shepherds, or a couple more dogs---I think it is nicer to call them shepherds than dogs.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Olivier, the news with Durban there will not be air letters. There will not be a inaudible for air letters, since we will have some just after and since we don't have money, we don't have the budget for it. Heidi?

HEIDI ULRICH:

Thank you. Just a couple of broader issues that I think will help staff. As we prepare the agendas and we have heard over the last many years

---

things about, "Let's lighten the agenda load a little bit." I very much appreciate---we all do---how hard Hugh has volunteered for it.

So we seem to have sort of a pendulum swinging back and forth in terms of, well do we want a lighter agenda that allows more time for hot issues, etc., or do we want one that is really packs in more things?

What I have seen over the last number of years, at the very end even though the decision may be made to lighten it, at the end the agendas are so tight minute by minute for perhaps valid reasons of inviting last minute requests or an identified need to bring someone in for a briefing---do we want longer meetings, how are we going to adjust for that?

Also, Tijani, just to clarify that there won't be an official (AL) RALO event in Durban, and there won't be one in the next autumn meeting as well--the AGM---because, again, the idea is that for the potential summit then they will all be holding their general assemblies during that summit.

In terms of additional assistance for the potential summit, there has been a concept note prepared for the idea of a possible exchange program that would ensure that some, perhaps ALAC structures, would come in and support you---not only in the lead up to the summit---but at the summit. So that's sort of being developed internally at the moment.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Heidi. I can answer your first question very quickly. When you shorten a week by one day, don't expect miracles, it doesn't give you more time.

HEIDI ULRICH: So, again, we are having a three-hour session here for the ExCom, but there is a three-hour ExCom and I think that that has worked better than the shorter ones we have had in the past. Also, at the AGM---this past AGM that you had the idea for the second wrap-up session for the new people, for the new leaders coming in and liaison reports; I think that's worked rather well, as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Heidi. Rinalia?

HEIDI ULRICH: Thank you Chair. It's a comment for Sebastian but also for staff. The ALAC wrap-up session required votes on specific statements that looked important. We didn't have all our ALAC members because of the conflict in scheduling, and I would expect that staff would know in terms of schedule what would conflict and when our members would not be in full quorum.

So I just want to understand how that happened and how we can avoid that for future meetings. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sebastian and then Heidi.

---

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: At what time, not this morning I guess.

STEVE ANOTONOFF: Yesterday morning, on Thursday morning we have a wrap up. This is like Sunday Mass and several of our members had to miss it, or miss parts of it, because we are engaged in working groups that decided they were going to do it there because on Thursday no one does any work anymore.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Sorry, I appreciate your question---not trying to petition. To find a time within this meeting to gather people from all communities, it is impossible; it's impossible. We can do whatever we want, we need to find a room, we need to find a time, it's impossible and conflicting.

You need to be clear, vis a vis: ICANN staff organizing the meeting that this must be less conflicting as possible for your members, but frankly I apologize because as I was a Chair and I was part of the decision at that time, one of the reasons is because usually this time was set up for public participation---open meeting of the PPC---and we just changed, not to have a participation meeting but to have this working group.

That's unfortunate but it was not good at all to say that there is no other work done at that time, it's even not true, because we get a lot of trouble to get a room with the right set up at the right time. Once again, I apologize to Tijani for not being in the two rooms at the same time, but it was not on purpose; but I get your point. Thank you.

HEIDI ULRICH:

Let me first address the particular issue of that meeting, but then also the broader issue of scheduling. So yesterday's meeting you can see that the original schedule as posted for the wrap-up session included a report from the RALO shares and you can see the times for those various issues.

If that schedule had been kept to there would have been only a ten-minute overlap, but because there was a last minute significant increase in a number of votes---eight---that were voted on, that necessitated that that agenda had to change last minute. In fact, we basically had to discuss those statements, rightly so, and that is where the difficulty came in---that's where the overlap came in.

So the broader issue then is, yes does the ExCom of the ALAC wish to schedule much more time for that particular item of ALAC action items during the wrap-up session rather than doing the reports, and if so where do these reports come in.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Heidi. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thursday has been a somewhat under-utilized time and therefore it is a time that other organizations, other parts of the community do choose to meet. I had a working group meeting that was scheduled 9:00 - 10:30 because it was an available time that we thought we could capture people.



---

We are encouraging people to participate in GNSO and ccNSO activities--we are going to find overlaps. It's something that we are going to have to live with and the new rules of procedure give us a lot more flexibility in holding over votes, in proxies and in various other things; but it is not going to disappear, it is going to get worse as we encourage more people in our community to go out and not just solely have blinders on.

I think we are going to have to live with it, we can tweak the schedule and hope to make it a little bit better, but that's always going to be

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Chair. So the question for me is then: Do we need to vote on statements at meetings. What is the benefit of doing that? Consider the pro and cons of that before we decide on how to go forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Rinalia. I can answer that. Do you wish to answer that Tijani? Go ahead Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I raised this point before---I don't see any interest in voting during the meeting. The best is to do it on-line because this will give us time to discuss---if we have things to discuss---and this will not prevent people who are absent from being part of the vote.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. I would like to address this: There are several reasons why a vote needs to take place at a meeting. The first one would be if a statement gets drafted at the meeting as a follow up to a meeting that we are having with another community and that we wish to do with a joint statement or something that we wish to present at the public forum as well.

So that has to be put on there and then. The second one is actually due to a glitch in the rest of the system which, hopefully, will be addressed at some point in that public common periods that end during the meeting or that end right after the meeting.

Everyone, after having spent a week here, is completely and utterly fried which means that for a week after this meeting--- for one full week---both volunteers and staff, may I add, have a right to take a break, and they do take a break. Therefore it is impossible if you launch today a five-day vote I can guarantee you that you will get one or two votes and that is it. Nothing else.

Not only that, we will have no one to submit the final report and I don't think it would be fair to put that burden on our staff. It would just not work out, so we do have to squeeze things where we have a common period that closes after the meeting or just during the meeting. We do have to squeeze as many as we can there and then--right now.

There is a definite decrease in volunteering involvement in the week following an ICANN meeting. So these are some of the reasons that I can think of right now as to why we need to do the vote whilst we are here. Alan, you wanted to add something?

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

The vote itself, if we change the mechanics of it just very slightly, we could do eight votes in five minutes or three minutes, or something like that. Right now, we are using a process and I am not picking on you, but Matt ended up calling out all the names of all the people sitting here six times.

He could have said, "Everyone except TD who is absent." There is these little mechanics where we can make it quick, we could also have an on-line vote all of Thursday, or whatever it is. No we can't, okay we can't.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Zero answer when you do an on-line vote. We have tried it, we had to go and Matt had to chase people around to find you and I am not ready to.....

ALAN GREENBERG:

I retract that one then. The real issue is not the vote with a bit of mechanical change, we can expedite that part, it's the discussion that goes along with it and some of that could have been pushed earlier in the week in the cases where we had the document ready---some of them we did, some of them we didn't.

So juggling schedules can make an ease-up on that particular problem by a significant amount if we think of it ahead of time. We deferred all the votes to Thursday because it was easier; we could have had some of the votes and certainly some of the discussion earlier in the week.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Alan. This is a question actually I would like to ask---this is a very, very good point indeed: Should we have some of the votes, the ones that we could have had earlier on in the week, which we made wait until that day---could we have them earlier in the week?

So I see people saying, "Yes," and at the same time I have an answer of some people saying, "Oh, hang on I can't make it on that day," then we have problems reaching a quorum. Go ahead Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: The mechanics aside and I agree that you could probably do some things that make it more productive in calling the votes and so on, but there is a real fundamental...

[Audio Ends Abruptly]

**[End of Transcript]**